HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 42 Wednesday, October 21, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

DEMOCRATS: *Reuther on the prowl*.....(page 1)
BROADWAY: *Political stage*.....(page 2)
REDS: *Gains and goals*.....(page 2)
KHRUSHCHEV: *As bad as Hitler*.....(page 3)
LABOR: *The modern monopoly*.....(page 4)

Twilight of the Democrats: Last week Democratic Chairman Paul Butler was observed sitting all alone in the Mayflower dining room, gloomy and thoughtful. To Washingtonians, this scene presented a symbol of the state of the Democratic party today.

For the Republicans are apparently heading into 1960 on a wave of "prosperity and peace," rejoicing in a record of Democratic defeats in the last session of Congress and projecting an image of the GOP standing foursquare for two popular policies—fiscal solvency and labor union reform. Such a picture may change, but today "liberal" Democrats privately and painfully admit their sad plight and add: "We haven't got a candidate."

A recent column by "bleeding heart" pro-Democratic columnist Ralph McGill illustrated the frustration of the "outs" who yearn to be "ins." The column drew many an amazed gasp on Capitol Hill.

McGill admitted that the Democratic candidate situation is "forlorn." He briefly brushed off the chances of Kennedy, Johnson, Symington and Humphrey; then sadly conceded that Adlai Stevenson, despite his "ability, intelligence, and experience" is in bad with the city machines and that the South "would almost certainly desert him."

Who then? The "liberal" columnist's startling suggestion is that possibly the Democrats may find the "best compromise candidate" in none other than Senator Frank J. Lausche of Ohio.

Now, the former Governor of Ohio is a rock-ribbed advocate of economy in Government and has earned the enmity of the labor bosses by his policies as Governor and his votes and speeches in the US Senate. No one on Capitol Hill, even among Lausche's admirers, believes that next year at the Los Angeles convention the man from Ohio could receive the nomination while Walter Reuther holds a first mortgage on the Democratic party. But the McGill performance does assume a significance as a symptom of the desperation of many Democrats.

Behind the depressed Democrats looms the crafty, far-seeing figure—Walter Reuther. Those who study the cool political guile of the man (as distinct from his rumpled, ranting oratorical acts on the rostrum) believe that he accepts the probability of a Democratic debacle next year. As was shown at the UAW convention last week in Atlantic City, Reuther will stick to the Democrats and, more important, he is now reportedly maneuvering for the nomination of his candidate. The man will be—according to many in Washington—Senator Hubert Humphrey.

The Minnesota Senator today is playing it "modest." But Jack Kennedy has already conceded to him the farm and plains states delegates in the Middle and Far West. It is believed that Governor Pat Brown, who is guided by Chicago-trained Paul Ziffren, national committeeman from California, will eventually throw his strength to Humphrey. Additionally, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's "liberals" in New York are basically "Humphrey people." Buttressing this coalition would be the many trade union members who habitually serve as convention delegates and would follow Reuther's lead. Nomination of Humphrey? Could be.

Humphrey, however, would—in view of the present GOP trend—in all likelihood be defeated in the ensuing election. But then—according to this thesis—Reuther would enjoy an enviable position, for he would have his man as caretaker of the Democratic party, preparatory to 1964. (Defeated Democratic Presidential candidates usually control the machinery of the party for the subsequent four years.)

While the CIO boss minimized suggestions of "Reuther for President" recently at Atlantic City, those who know him are convinced that he regards himself as the predestined nominee of a firmly left-oriented Democratic-Labor party in 1964.

So, at least, runs one piece of crystal ball gazing which has gained considerable currency in the Nation's Capital.

Steel Strike: In the confused picture of last week's steel strike negotiations—a fact-finding board, the public back-and-forth between union and industry, the imminence of a return to work for an 80-day cooling-off period, etc.—conservatives on Capitol Hill showed nervousness about the complexion of the supposedly impartial fact-finding board.

The chairman is Professor George W. Taylor, who has been known in Washington for over 15 years as a New Deal economist and "labor expert." He served on the War Labor Board under Roosevelt and Truman and on the Wage Stabilization Board under Truman. On the former board, he was part of the same milieu which included then-professor (now Senator) Wayne Morse. Those were the days under F.D.R. and Truman when impartial panels framed "settlement recommendations" which cleverly put business on the spot so that employers could not refuse the "settlement" offered without appearing "unreasonable" in the uninformed public's eye. Taylor is also known as an "arbitrator" in labor disputes. "Arbitration," under the present circumstances, carries the connotation of compulsory arbitration, and that—as Senator Taft warned repeatedly—would mean "fixing" wages and would lead to "fixing" prices. One other

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

member of the Taylor board is Paul Lehoczky, also well-known in industry circles as an "arbitrator."

Furthermore, another aspect of last week's proceedings was the implication that the steel strike should be settled by the fact-finding board "recommending" a settlement. Such "recommended settlements" were just what Taft, through the Taft-Hartley Act, sought to bar. He—together with Senators Ball and Jenner—succeeded in incorporating in the act a prohibition against allowing a board of inquiry to make recommendations for settlement—to do so, he felt, would be equivalent to compulsory arbitration. Taft had seen too many recommended settlements put over by Roosevelt's labor experts which led inevitably to outcomes far more favorable to the labor bosses than to management.

Capitol Camera: Ambassador "Chip" Bohlen returns to Washington from Manila to the accompaniment of much critical comment from Capitol Hill. Bohlen's diplomatic career has been littered with failure after failure—advisor to F.D.R. at the disastrous Yalta conference; instigator of Ike's epistolary flirtation with Marshal Zhukov, followed by the not surprising disappearance of Zhukov from the Russian scene; Dulles' dissatisfaction with Bohlen's conduct as Ambassador to Moscow and the latter's demotion to the post in the Philippines. Now, critical comment notes that after two years in Manila, Bohlen leaves with US-Philippine relations at their lowest ebb since independence was granted to those Pacific islands. The open anti-Americanism of many Filipinos today was noted recently at a function at which a Philippine diplomat insulted Walter Robertson, recent head of the State Department's Asian Affairs division.

● *The build-up for Democratic Presidential hopeful Governor Edmund (Pat) Brown of California has already encountered an obstacle: a simple matter of honesty. Last year, when Brown was campaigning for the governorship, he accused his opponent, Senator Knowland, of seeking the gubernatorial prize as a stepping-stone to the Presidency. "If it were offered me," said Brown, "I would refuse the nomination and if elected, I would refuse to serve."*

Today it is different. Recently Lawrence E. Spivak on "Meet the Press" reminded Brown of this statement. Brown had to admit lamely that he had changed his position. Campaign oratory?

● Washington awaits with interest a third party rally which will be held in Chicago at the Morrison Hotel on October 23 and 24.

● Two seasons ago on Broadway, *Sunrise at Campobello,* a Rooseveltian soap opera written by left-wing Democrat Dore Schary and perpetuating the myth of the Hyde Park clan, enjoyed a long run.

The "liberals" are back on the political stage with *The Gang's All Here,* supposedly a takeoff of the Harding Administration but apparently also a dig at Republicans and the Ike-Adams era, since Melvyn Douglas (husband of Helen Gahagan, beaten by Dick Nixon for the Senate in 1950) plays a politically unsophisticated President manipulated by others.

Off-stage suggestion: Why doesn't some enterprising producer drag a few beatnik espresso shops and come up with a cast to portray the characters Eleanor Roosevelt used to parade through the White House?

● Roswell Garst, Khrushchev's host in Coon Rapids, Iowa, has been quoted recently as saying, "I've never been able to find out where extreme conservatism leaves off and stupidity begins." Farmer Garst, as Representative H. R. Gross (R.-Ia.) reports, is making "liberalism" pay off in dollars and cents—he has received $55,000 in farm subsidies in the last two years. His farm is known as a model of modern large-scale farming, and his trips to Russia certainly belie his "need" for subsidies. Observers here are also unable to find out where Garst's (and the New Deal farm subsidies') "extreme liberalism" leaves off and stupidity begins.

US Communist Party: The top officials of the Communist Party of the United States have benefited greatly from the Khrushchev visit and have charted an ambitious course to enlarge the party and to reinforce its impact on the American public scene. This is the report of knowledgeable investigators on Capitol Hill who have their own way of knowing what goes on within the Red ranks in this country.

CP officials show great confidence since the Soviet dictator toured America. They feel that the visit has given the party a new aura of "respectability." They predict that the party will enjoy a new tolerance which it has not experienced since the days of World War II, when Soviet Russia and the US were co-belligerents and the then CP leader Earl Browder was accorded no little respect by Government officials and by the press.

Congressional probers say that the CP held a meeting (unreported in the press) in Carnegie Hall in New York on September 25, while Khrushchev was still in the country.

National Secretary Eugene Dennis extolled the Soviet dictator and emphasized the party line that the USSR is now and has for years been working for "world peace." He expressed great confidence in the future of the American Communist party and said it is on "the threshold of a new era" of expansion. He asserted that it would soon emerge as a "mass party" of the working-class. (This resurgence of confidence also appears in the action of the Canadian Communists, who last week threw off the "cover name" of "Labor Progressive Party" and reverted openly to the title of "Canadian Communist Party.")

The Communist Party of the US has laid down a strategy as follows:

(1) Party units will hide behind a strong line of "improvement in relations between the USSR and the US," and continual reiteration of the "peace" and "disarmament" themes.

(2) Party units must keep up a drumfire directed at all American political leaders, both GOP and Democrat, who make statements skeptical of Khrushchev's peaceful intentions and his alleged "relaxation of the cold war." Nixon is particularly singled out as a target by the Commies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) *The party will work actively in the schools and colleges, and particularly in the steel and railroad industries because strikes (present and expected) should provide a fertile field for Communist organizers.*

(4) Party leaders are admonished to be "bold" and militant, because—the Communist Executive Board feels—they will be less vulnerable to congressional probes ("McCarthyism") because of Supreme Court rulings and because of the "honeymoon" following the Khrushchev visit.

The next CP convention is scheduled for the end of November in New York City, not in Chicago as originally planned. Reasons for the change are not known.

Russia and China: One authoritative and widely respected reporter dissents from the prevailing view that Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung are at odds. Karl H. Von Wiegand, known as "dean of all American foreign correspondents," cables from Asia that, despite Khrushchev's reception in the US, the Russian dictator ironed out his differences with the Red Chinese overlord during the former's recent visit to Peiping.

Von Wiegand, in his dispatch to the New York *Journal-American*, says that the twain made an agreement to divide the globe north of the equator into two areas of Red operations, working in close cooperation although under separate direction. "Moscow would take direction of the Communist offensive of 'peaceful coexistence' in Europe, the US, Mexico and Central America," says Von Wiegand, while, "all Asia would come under Peiping along with certain developments in North Africa, particularly the Algerian difficulties." The American correspondent stresses that "Red China's major objective is India where Nehru is trying desperately to maintain a Western parliamentary system. His peril is increased by the multiplicity of parties, all lusting for power. Blind to Nehru's attempted social reforms, they are preparing India's millions of hungry and impoverished for communism." Karl Von Wiegand's conclusion about the Khrushchev-Mao deal: "Russia is taking on the assignment of converting the country with the highest living standard in the world, and Red China the nation with the lowest."

How to Prevent Labor Trouble: The New York *Daily News* last week ran a series on companies which thrive by encouraging employees to partake of company stock purchase and profit-sharing pension plans. These policies encourage workers to strive for the betterment of the outfit rather than take potshots at management.

Thus, Sears Roebuck workers, realizing the wisdom of joining with management in organization *esprit de corps* because of profit sharing, get maximum mileage out of work materials and go so far as to call up and complain when they see unnecessary lights on in stores after dark.

General Robert E. Wood last week received an award from the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, for his part in developing the profit-sharing plan at Sears, of which he was Chairman of the Board for many years.

Between Covers: The Nation's Capital has more than its share of cynics—but even the most hardened veterans were shocked and revolted by the inhumanity depicted in *The Crimes of Khrushchev—Part 2*, testimony presented before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The booklet consists of statements by nine Ukrainian refugees and Americans of Ukrainian background, detailing the unbelievable bestiality in that unfortunate country when Khrushchev ruled it during the 1930's.

Mass famine and starvation were state policies implemented by exporting the produce of this great Grain Belt. Mass murder was another tactic used to crush any threat of Ukrainian nationalism. The atrocities resulting from these policies (all carried out at Khrushchev's orders) are set forth in words and pictures—the latter have to be seen to be believed.

Said one Washingtonian after reading the testimony: "To think that any American could applaud that man! He is as bad as Hitler."

● *First Principles*, a reprint of a series of 20 editorials which appeared in the Sunday *Chicago Tribune*, defines the character in which the Republican party must appear if it is to justify its continuing existence (40¢ from the *Chicago Tribune*, Chicago, Illinois).

● *For the Skeptics*, edited by Lyle Munson, is a digest of official Government hearings on Communist activity in the US ($3, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, New York 16, N.Y.).

● *How the Reds Won*, by Rosalie Gordon, explains the lessons behind American Soviet parleys. This documented pamphlet takes the reader through the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam meetings (25¢, America's Future, 542 Main St., New Rochelle, New York).

KENNETH L. GOLD, Editor-in-chief, student newspaper, University of Connecticut: "I think HUMAN EVENTS is excellent background material and would like to reprint portions so our students can be exposed to it."

RAYMOND JENKINS, Dean of the Faculty, Catawba College (North Carolina): "An excellent antidote to the ephemeral press."

H. W. HEBBLETHWAITE, President, Portland City College (Oregon): "The point of view expressed is usually quite different from mine, therefore it is good for me to read it. I see to it that my copies are placed where others may read them."

C. E. BASHAM, Chairman, Economics Department, Indiana Technical College: "Very informative articles. I enjoy them very much."

W.J. BELL, Chairman, Communications Department, East Texas State College: "I think we need the conservative as well as all other viewpoints for the full education of our students. Too often they never have this opportunity."

SISTER M. EVANGELINE, Chairman, History Department, Catholic University of Puerto Rico: "I find the pamphlets so very tersely expressive of the topics of the moment. Many, many thanks."

PAUL L. ADAMS, Academic Dean, Roberts Wesleyan College (New York): "I regard HUMAN EVENTS as the most literate and informed source of information of its kind that there is in the field, and I try to sell it to my students as such. This is a small college, but I am trying to further the cause of an intelligent conservatism."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor's Dollar Diplomacy: Oh, for the days of the big stick and the Thomas Nast cartoon, when Government was faced with the task of muzzling the great barons of industry with the Sherman Anti-Trust Act! So say legislators faced with the realization that Congress will soon have to grapple with the behemoth task of cutting down big labor's country-wide monopoly.

They look back at an era when the big business trusts were pictured as portly cigar smokers in high hats and dollar-sign vests, capable of buying a Congressman as easily as ordering dinner at Delmonico's.

Many a spineless and greedy legislator peered out of the dollar-sign vest pockets in those days, but today's conscientious lawmaker must plan to legislate against a monopoly whose lobbying operations are designed and carried out on a far greater scale and with the brazen precision of a commando raid.

The dimensions of the labor bosses' power grab dates the lobbying tactics of old-time business tycoons with the flying wedge and barge prize fights.

In Washington, the Capitol is ringed with labor fortresses. The teamsters, whose boss Jimmy Hoffa brags that he can raise $5 million for a political campaign, spent that much on a lavish Louisiana Avenue headquarters complete with a penthouse lounge, its picture windows offering a beautiful view of a prime Hoffa target—Capitol Hill.

During the last session of Congress, when labor was fighting the Landrum-Griffin bill, newsmen estimated that Hoffa had 250 men lobbying on the Hill and in surrounding hotels.

The brain center of uniondom's operation is the AFL-CIO building in the shadow of the White House, where a staff of 300 works on federation affairs and a special section is set aside where workers do nothing but attempt to find ways to influence or block legislation. Built at a cost of $4.5 million, it looks more like a Miami Beach hotel than a business building.

The Bakery and Confectionery Workers recently spent $6 million on a building and expect to gross $750,000 a year from space rentals.

Other new and shiny citadels from which labor carries on its siege up Capitol Hill and toward the executive branch (there are no lobbying regulations covering either the executive or judicial branches of the Federal Government) are the $3.2 million Operating Engineers' Union building, the $2.5 million Communications Workers of America building, the $575,000 Philip Murray (Electrical Workers) building and the soon-to-be-completed Hod Carriers' Union building with an estimated final cost of $2 million.

Sometime in 1960 the Carpenters' Union expects to begin construction on a $2 million building within a few blocks of the Capitol.

There are now 52 labor organizations with headquarters in Washington—twice as many as in 1939. Sixteen national unions have buildings in the District of Columbia, such as those described above, and their total cost is estimated to exceed $30 million.

Just how much labor spent in its recent attempt to defeat the Landrum-Griffin bill can only be guessed. In 1958, an election year, unions reported political contributions totaling $1,441,767. Washington experts who attempt to keep tabs on labor's political spending liken this figure to the old iceberg analogy, with the major share of union political spending never coming to the surface.

On October 2 the teamsters announced that they were setting up a political action department to rival the AFL-CIO's political wing. Needless to say the "rivalry" will not alter the political direction of either group, and no one doubts Hoffa's claim that he could raise that $5 million.

Labor's ability to spend politically was dramatized last fall during the California campaign, when the labor forces were out to defeat Bill Knowland and the right-to-work proposition.

There, 27 unions spent $1.3 million to defeat the proposition, while only $390,420 was spent in its favor. Knowland, far from receiving the full support of the "big business interests," was left to fight union campaigners practically alone.

In 1958, 70 per cent of the candidates receiving money from the labor bosses were elected, and of the 184 House Democrats who originally voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill in the last session, 115 had received campaign money from the AFL-CIO.

To show further that labor has become "big business" in its own right, a look at the hard lot of union bosses is in order.

George M. Harrison of the Railway Clerks Union receives $60,000 a year. Walter Reuther limits himself to $22,000 a year—still enough to put him in America's top four-tenths of one per cent in annual salary.

David McDonald can afford to sit out a long strike with $50,000 a year, and while the wives of his striking steelworkers try to squeeze enough out of the budget to buy groceries, McDonald cavorts with the Washington white tie set at posh dinners.

Recently the Washington *Daily News* reported that wealthy Washington hostess Gwen Cafritz picked up McDonald's place card at a dinner, turned to him and said: "What do you do, Mr. McDonald?"

Answered the tough boss, who is apparently more affected by the heady nectar of power than the wine he consumes at such affairs: "You dumb broad, I'm on the front pages all over the country." If statistics don't prompt anti-monopoly action, McDonald's remarks should serve as the clincher.

FREE 1959 BOUND VOLUME of HUMAN EVENTS if you buy $60 or more in Christmas gift subscriptions. Two or more one-year subscriptions —one of which may be your own—$9 each. You can make out your entire Christmas gift list in JUST 20 MINUTES! Mail your list today. We'll bill you in January!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 42 HUMAN EVENTS October 21, 1959

ARTICLE SECTION I

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

'Easing the Tensions'

The Frightful Price That Some Would Pay for 'Peace'

By FREDERIC NELSON

Associate Editor of the Saturday Evening Post

SOMEWHAT MORE THAN A YEAR AGO the United States Senate worked itself into what the *Washington Post* described as "an altogether silly lather" over a report that the Department of Defense has hired a research corporation to look into the circumstances which might necessitate an American surrender after devastating nuclear attacks. Despite the *Post's* editorial assertion that it was only "prudent" to be prepared for surrender if the going got too rough (100 million casualties or so), most of the Senators present went along with the average American's feeling that, since we have no intention of surrendering, why make a survey of the subject?

As far as nuclear attack goes, that is probably the way most Americans feel about surrender. But the visit of Khrushchev, the Butcher of Budapest and the Usurper of the Ukraine, has released a new kind of subservience which came as a surprise and a shock to people who thought they had seen everything. "Liberals" who can eat their chicken *a la king* and pie *a la mode* at luncheons of one-world intelligentsia are notoriously gullible, but I would never have expected even such groups to submit to lectures by the murderer of thousands of Hungarians, and the treacherous assassin of their leaders, without somebody nailing him with a hard roll.

This phenomenon sent many a patriotic citizen to the bicarbonate tin, and for many, revulsion must have been succeeded by alarm, and a new look at last year's "surrender" scare in the US Senate. Surrender before a shot has been fired would be something new in the glorious annals of the USA.

The American bourgeoisie, or at any rate a distressingly large hunk of it, has already surrendered its wits, its judgment and its moral sensibilities. Having done that, these people are surely less likely than before to say "No!" to the next step, perhaps a plausible "concession" on Germany or Laos in the interest of "peace," to which President Eisenhower has said there is "no alternative!" To a military attack, the response would be resistance, a fact which Khrushchev already understands, just as he knows that a shooting war would mean the end of his tyranny. Therefore he attacks this country on the discussion group front, and barring some heavy fire from people who can't forgive wholesale murder even to obtain a Communist "peace," he scored triumphs more important, and at less risk to him and his racket, than if his missiles had flattened Kansas City.

This is what has come of "easing tensions" when we should have been crying havoc. Whatever our military, air, and missile strength *vis-a-vis* the USSR may have been, the ratio now is probably less favorable because a great many people who ought to know better have tranquilized themselves into believing that Khrushchev is a simple peasant who likes his martinis 24 to 1 but means no harm.

People who shudder at the proximity of Dictator Trujillo, demand the deportation of Dictator Jiminez, and got attacks of nerves when Dictator Batista visited Miami, see nothing amiss when Khrushchev, the Big Daddy of all dictators, is invited to this country. The Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, head of the National Council of Churches, worked up a prayer for the "safety" of Khrushchev ("Bless Thy little lamb tonight"). No divine protection was sought for Batista and Jiminez.

Curiously enough the leaders of the Hallelujah Chorus which welcomed Khrushchev are the spiritual heirs—indeed often the same individuals—who 20 years ago detected the menace to this country in Hitler's carrying-on, before Adolf had much to menace us with, or dreamed of trying with what he had. The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, known then as the William Allen White Committee, was not created to "ease tensions" but to soup them up.

The Committee started right off with a full page ad, compiled by the late Robert E. Sherwood, the caption on which was "Stop Hitler Now!" To be sure, by that time Hitler had overrun France and the low countries and looked like a mortal cinch to knock England out of the war. There was plenty of reason to get excited over these possibilities, although Hitler had at no time threatened to "bury" the United States or indeed shown anything but a disposition to keep out of our way.

IF 20 YEARS AGO Americans had remained for years locked up in Nazi jails while Nazi fighter planes attacked unarmed American aircraft, it takes no unusually gifted imagination to picture the hullabaloo in Washington.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If Khrushchev has the idea that we are "paper tigers," he has more to go on than Hitler had. Newspapers dug up Khrushchev's old speeches and solemnly assured their readers that Khrushchev was "against colonialism," that the USSR never interfered in the internal affairs of other countries and that Khrushchev had "taught the Russian people to smile again" (Salisbury in *New York Times*). Those like the Mayor of Los Angeles and a group of labor leaders in San Francisco who annoyed the guest by serious questions, were admonished.

All this is par for the course, but one would think that even a "liberal" would be worrying (politely of course) about Khrushchev's far from secret intentions, instead of speculating dreamily as to whether or not this fat conspirator was "impressed" by what he saw in this country, or whether he really would give us at least a 10 per cent break at a summit conference.

His most evident and immediate intention is to conquer this country by internal subversion and paralysis of its intelligence and will. Twenty years ago we worried about things like that. Fritz Kuhn and a dreary group of German-Americans singing Deutschland Uber Alles in Yorkville's bierstuben convinced people, including public officials, that Hitler could take us over from within. No "easing of tensions" then! Instead, Kuhn and a bunch of sad pamphleteers were rounded up at various places, tried and sent to prison. This collection of amateur fanatics and propagandists contrasted poorly with the Communist apparatus of today—or for that matter with the Communist apparatus of that day—but they did alert America to its danger. Today, when congressional committees, enforcement agencies and even the US Attorney General agree that Soviet spying is at a new high, who's excited? Those who express concern over this state of affairs are either ignored or denounced as "extremists." Such Red spies as we catch are sprung by the Supreme Court.

ALTHOUGH "EASING OF TENSIONS" calls for no unseemly fuss about subversion and the means by which the Reds expect to defeat us, it is still *de rigeur* to mention the Soviet military menace. Scaring the daylights out of us on account of sputniks, missles, bombs and fallout is an important feature of Red propaganda. Exaggeration of our obvious deficiencies has been successful in blinding Americans to the weakness of the Soviet Empire, to the possibility that Khrushchev couldn't make war if he wanted to, for fear of revolution in the enslaved countries, or even at home. Refugees hear that the Soviet system is riddled with official corruption, "slow-downs" and pilfering by discontented workers, hatred and silent resistance by the relatives of the 25 million prisoners in concentration camps. In Hungary, remember, Soviet soldiers deserted to the freedom fighters! Just recently a Hungarian who is an alumnus of Nazi and Communist prison camps, told me:

"For the first time in my life I am frightened. Always before now, however badly things went, I have reassured myself by the thought that all was not lost as long as America stood out. Today I am worried—not that you will be beaten in a war (Khrushchev does not dare attack you), but that you will retreat so far to maintain peace that in the end giving up will seem the only reasonable thing to do."

At the moment it doesn't appear that our official leaders are even particular about saving their faces. Khrushchev was received here, wined, dined, ogled and toasted after his Chinese goons had attacked Laos; after his Hungarian goons had shown their contempt for us by murdering ten Hungarian freedom fighters three years after the revolt; after he himself had written articles and issued statements indicating continued determination to destroy this country and all it has stood for. One purpose is common to all these episodes—a contemptuous challenge to "imperialistic America" and a demonstration to the satellites and weak nations generally that they need expect no aid from the United States.

IN PERIODS WHEN FRANKNESS was considered a virtue and not an evidence of "extremist" bad manners, almost nobody would have fallen for the idea that once a gangster blackmails his way into the White House, he becomes *ipso facto* a genteel "guest of the Nation" not to be picketed by anybody. But our danger is that blurred distinctions, avoidance of definition and the mush-headed relativism built into us from the first grade, may make us incapable of resistance to the "nihilist tidal wave," simply because we won't recognize it when we see it.

That the country be delivered from this curse of double-think should be a daily American prayer.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "EASING THE TENSIONS" at $ _____

[] Payment encosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; ordered reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 42 HUMAN EVENTS October 21, 1959

ARTICLE SECTION II

A Great Negro Conservative

What Would Booker T. Washington Say Now?

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By WILLIAM HAZLITT UPSON
Author, Alexander Botts Earthworm Tractor Stories in the Saturday Evening Post *and other stories*

IN 1900 BOOKER T. WASHINGTON published his autobiography, *Up From Slavery*. It is one of the great American success stories, and it is also a treasury of ideas for the advancement of colored people—a subject of vital importance today.

The author tells how he was born a slave on a Virginia plantation, probably in 1858 or 1859, the illegitimate son of a Negro slave woman and a white man whose name he never learned. His early years were spent in "the most miserable, desolate and discouraging surroundings"—a tumble-down cabin with a dirt floor, windows that were mere openings without glass, and an open fire for cooking. After the Civil War, his Negro stepfather, his mother and three children moved to West Virginia. Here they lived in a cabin even more primitive than when they were slaves. Young Booker, scarcely more than ten years old, was put to work in a salt mine. "Often," he says, "I began work as early as four o'clock in the morning."

After several years in the salt mine, Booker heard that a Negro could receive an education at a place called the Hampton Institute in Virginia. His stepfather gave him permission to go. And with almost no money he walked several hundred miles across the State of Virginia to Hampton. When he arrived, he was so ragged and dirty he was afraid he would not be admitted. However, one of the teachers asked him to sweep out a recitation room.

"Never," says he, "did I receive an order with more delight . . . . I swept the recitation room three times."

Young Booker stayed at Hampton several years; then he returned to West Virginia to teach other Negroes to read. Later he was recalled to Hampton as a teacher. In 1881, the head of the school "received a letter from some gentleman in Alabama asking him to recommend someone to take charge of what was to be a normal school for the colored people in the little town of Tuskegee in that state." The head of the Hampton school recommended young Booker Washington, who was then in his early twenties.

He went to Tuskegee, where he says the white people, as well as the colored, were greatly interested in the starting of the new school. The first classes were held in "a stable and a hen house." Thirty students reported for admission. Booker Washington was the only teacher.

Almost at once the school began receiving gifts—including one from an old colored woman who said, "I ain't got no money, but I wants you to take dese six eggs, what I's been savin' up, an' I wants you to put dese six eggs into de eddication of dese boys an' gals." Apparently most Negroes, in those days, used this strange Uncle Remus type of dialect.

Many of the students thought that if they acquired some "book learning" they could live a life of ease. Said a colored man who worked in a cotton field: "De work am so hard and the sun am so hot dat I b'lieve dis darky am called to preach!" Booker Washington gently discouraged this attitude. He insisted that all the students at Tuskegee should work to build up the school. As soon as the institution acquired some land, the students worked several days each week putting up buildings, making furniture, and raising vegetables and livestock to provide themselves with food. In addition to training teachers, the school began sending out into the community many workmen skilled in various trades who became such useful citizens that the school gained the good will of the entire community, both white and Negro.

LIKE OTHER SCHOOLS, Tuskegee always needed money. At first there were small contributions from the white and colored people in and near Tuskegee. Later as the reputation of the school spread, Booker Washington received invitations to talk about his school before larger and larger audiences in the North as well as in the South. The biggest contributions came from the North, where there was more money. But there was just as much good will in the South, and there were many contributions from white southerners as well as from Negroes.

Gradually the school grew in numbers and in wealth. In 1900, when the book *Up From Slavery* was published, there were 1400 students, and resources of over a million and a half dollars. The material progress of the school was accompanied by a great increase in its reputation. And the personal prestige of Booker Washington reached greater and greater heights. In 1895 he gave the opening address at the great International Exposition in Atlanta, Georgia. This was at the invitation of the all-white Exposition Committee, and with the hearty approval of the Mayor of Atlanta and the Governor of Georgia. There were other talks to other important audiences, both North and South. And Booker Washington's advice on racial problems was sought by Grover Cleveland, William McKinley,

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Theodore Roosevelt. He was on friendly terms with many leaders of industry such as Andrew Carnegie, Collis P. Huntington and George Eastman, and with leaders in education such as Charles W. Eliot. When he visited Europe he was entertained at various American Embassies and received at tea by Queen Victoria.

This former slave was definitely a success. How did he do it?

In the first place he had great determination. Seemingly insurmountable difficulties never stopped him.

He always admired worthwhile achievement. He admired the white teachers at Hampton. He admired the Negro teachers at Tuskegee. He was proud of the way his son learned to be a highly competent bricklayer. And he was proud of his daughter's skill as a dressmaker. He admired William McKinley, whom he describes as "always calm, self-possessed, patient, and polite." When he had tea with Queen Victoria, Miss Susan B. Anthony was also present, and he was deeply impressed at meeting " two women so remarkable in different ways."

He felt the future of the Negro race in this country was very bright. He never advocated any sort of forced integration, but insisted that the Negro could better his condition only through his own individual efforts in striving to become a better citizen, and by working for the good of the community as a whole. He was mildly amused by a Negro who said, "When we finds out which way de white man's gwine to vote, den we votes 'zactly de other way. Den we know we's right." Booker Washington always wanted Negroes to vote for the best interests of both races. He kept assuring his students that if they took care first of their duties and obligations as good citizens, their rights and privileges would come to them naturally. This philosophy worked well in his own case. And he believed it would work well for the entire Negro race.

AT THE PRESENT TIME, however, many Negro leaders as well as white "liberals" are advocating a very different approach to racial problems. As good a description of this new approach as I can find is in the October 20, 1956 *The Nation* in an article "I Won't Vote" by W. E. B. DuBois. The editors of *The Nation* describe Dr. Dubois as a distinguished Negro educator, writer, and lecturer. He is a graduate of Harvard and a Doctor of Philosophy. He has written many books and has been a leader in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He speaks with authority.

In his article in *The Nation* he explains that in all past elections his vote "had to be limited by the candidate's attitude toward Negroes." He says, "In 1912 I wanted to support Theodore Roosevelt, but his Bull Moose Convention dodged the Negro problem . . . . In 1920 I supported Harding because of his promise to liberate Haiti . . . . In 1932 I voted for Franklin Roosevelt, since Hoover was unthinkable." He decided not to vote at all in the 1956 election because neither party offered anything substantial to Negroes.

"What," he asks, "has the (Republican) Administration done to rescue Negro workers . . . while the Nation sends billions abroad to protect oil investments and help employ slave labor in the Union of South Africa and the Rhodesias?"

Eisenhower, he says, is "a sick man" and "Stevenson stands on the race question in the South not far from where his grandfather Adlai stood 63 years ago."

Regarding the state of the union in general, Dr. DuBois is as pessimistic as Booker Washington was optimistic. "American culture," he says, "is rotting away . . . . Our manners are gone and the one thing we want is to be rich—to show off . . . . Business is built on successful lying called advertising . . . . Democracy is dead in the United States."

The Republicans and Democrats are equally bad. And the only hope for Negroes would be a third party which "must advocate such things as Government ownership of the means of production; Government in business; the limitation of private profit; social medicine; Government housing and Federal aid to education; the total abolition of race bias; and the welfare state."

WHAT WOULD BOOKER WASHINGTON say to this program? Well, he has said it already in *Up From Slavery*. Anyone who wants a sane and constructive program for the continued advancement of colored people would do well to read the entire book. It is available in most libraries, and the paper-covered Bantam reprint sells for 50 cents at many news stands.

One paragraph merits reading several times: "I think," says Booker Washington, "that the whole future of my race hinges on the question as to whether or not it can make itself of such indispensable value that the people in the town and state where we reside will feel that our presence is necessary to the happiness and well-being of the community. No man who continues to add something to the material, intellectual, and moral well-being of the place in which he lives is long left without proper reward. This is a great human law which cannot be permanently nullified."

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me ____ reprints of "A GREAT NEGRO CONSERVATIVE" at $ ----------

[] Payment encosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; ordered reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name ----------

Street ----------

City ---------- Zone -------- State ----------

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED